



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,181	07/25/2003	Min-Yi Shih	134404	5586
7590	06/10/2005			EXAMINER
General Electric Company			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
CRD Patent Docket Rm 4A59			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bldg. K-1			1732	
P.O. Box 8				
Schenectady, NY 12301			DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/628,181	SHIH ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 41-63 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/25/03, 2/11/05.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either of Chandross et al (see col. 1, line 34; col. 2, lines 42-63; col. 5, lines 29-53; see Fig. 2D) or Suzuki et al (see col. 3, line 5; col. 6, line 62; col. 7, lines 53-67; col. 9, lines 40-44).

Either applied reference discloses the instant method of forming a waveguide with a core and index contrast (or scattering) region employing the instant steps of deposition of a polymerizable composite comprising a binding polymer and monomer onto a substrate to form a layer, patterning the layer using a mask to define exposed and unexposed areas, irradiating the exposed areas with ultraviolet radiation and volatizing the uncured monomer to form the waveguide. While the references are silent with respect to the aspect of the cladding, the steps are the same and hence it is submitted that the substrate itself inherently functions as a cladding in these processes.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Chandross et al or Suzuki et al in view of White (see Fig. 2B and col. 6, lines 52-60).

Chandross et al and Suzuki et al are applied generally for reasons of record as set forth in paragraph 1, *supra*, the primary references essentially lacking a clear showing of forming a waveguide with a cladding and the particular patterning steps as set forth in instant claims 16 and 33. Concerning the former, if the substrate is not inherently—ie, does not inherently function as-- the cladding, then White is applied to teach that waveguides are made either by application of a separate cladding layer or with the substrate functioning as such. Based on White, it certainly would have been obvious to have formed a separate cladding layer on the substrate in addition to the layer functioning as the core. Concerning the exact patterning used, it is submitted that such would have been an obvious feature in the process of either primary reference dependent on the exact waveguide desired. Both primary references disclose polymers and monomers very similar to those set forth in the instant claims and it is submitted that the exact materials used would have been within the skill level of the art. The primary references disclose patterning with a mask having windows and a grey scale mask would have been an obvious modification thereto dependent on the exact waveguide structure desired. The same is true of patterning to define at least one curve.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11

F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-40 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No. 10/306,439. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each application essentially sets forth similar methods of making waveguides by selectively patterning a composite polymerizable layer and exposing the layer to radiation to make the waveguide.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 571 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot  
June 7, 2005

*M. Vargot*  
Mathieu D. Vargot  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1732

*6/7/05*